

pendents of a later time. To these men the liturgy and government of the Anglican Church were sheer popery. In Church government they were pure democrats. To the congregation, as a Christian brotherhood, they attributed the sole right of regulating congregational affairs. It should elect all its office-bearers, from the minister downwards. On the vote of the members all jurisdiction depended, and each congregation was independent of every other in the management of its affairs. Congregational autonomy was absolute, and on this autonomy the State might not encroach except in things temporal. The laity might prophesy to their hearts' content; there was no distinction between laic and cleric, and the congregational vote which conferred the office of minister might recall it. Priesthood was unscriptural, and with a Church, whose ministers were priests, which was subject to unchristian laws and enforced legalised doctrines, they would have no communion. Nay, they would not hold fellowship with any body of believers that did not share their own views. On this point they were more exclusive and in-tolerant than their persecutors. They were, however, orthodox in doctrine, and in this respect they differed from other sectaries like the Anabaptists, the Family of Love, and an occasional Unitarian, who declared hostility not only to the episcopal order and the Prayer Book, but attacked some of the dogmas of the Thirty-nine Articles. To Unitarians like John Lewes the doctrine of the Trinity was both irrational and unscriptural. To the Anabaptists infant baptism was incompatible with regeneration, and they seem to have shared some of the more enlightened principles of the Continental sectaries from whom they took their name. Some of their distinctive opinions they seem to have imbibed from Dutch refugees, two of whom were barbarously burned as heretics at Smithfield in 1575. The Farnilists of Love, as the followers of Henry Nicholas, a Dutchman of Amsterdam, called themselves, claimed an inner light which, if we may believe their enemies, substituted the vagaries of the mystic imagination for the traditional dogmas, and left room neither for orthodoxy nor for morality. In reality they seem to have been pious people, who, like the modern Quakers, took their inspiration directly from the Holy Spirit instead of from the Apostles and the Fathers, and to